

Asymptotic l_p spaces and bounded distortions

Vitali D. Milman Nicole Tomczak-Jaegermann

Abstract

The new class of Banach spaces, so-called asymptotic l_p spaces, is introduced and it is shown that every Banach space with bounded distortions contains a subspace from this class. The proof is based on an investigation of certain functions, called enveloping functions, which are intimately connected with stabilization properties of the norm.

0 Introduction

During the last year several problems of infinite-dimensional Banach space theory, which remained open for decades, have been finally solved. Some new constructions of Banach spaces have been made which, on one hand, showed limitations of the theory, but on the other hand, also showed how exciting an infinite-dimensional geometry can be. Let us mention few of them:

- (i) a space without unconditional basic sequence (Gowers–Maurey),
- (ii) a space not isomorphic to any of its hyperplanes (Gowers),
- (iii) a space such that every bounded operator being a Fredholm operator (Gowers–Maurey).

The problems which were answered by these examples are of a linear-topological nature. Although a thorough study of this kind of properties flourished back in the 60s, methods developed that time and later were not sufficient to successfully attack these problems. The solutions given last year are by-products of a study in a different direction: the infinite-dimensional

geometry of convex bodies, that is, the geometry of the unit sphere of a Banach space.

In this introduction we would like to explain the geometry which led to the breakthrough described above; and in the main body of the paper we would like to add some information in this geometric direction.

0.1 In fact, the topic of studies which led to the recent development takes its roots, in a large part, in the local theory of Banach spaces, in other words, in the asymptotic theory of finite-dimensional normed spaces. Consider the following question:

Let $f(\cdot)$ be a uniformly continuous real valued function on the unit sphere $S = S(X) = \{x \in X \mid \|x\| = 1\}$ of an infinite-dimensional Banach space X . Does the oscillation of f decrease to zero on some sequence E_n of infinite-dimensional subspaces of X ?

To state it in a more precise way we need some notation. For a fixed function f as above, and for an arbitrary subspace $E \subset X$, let $I_E(f) = [a(E), b(E)]$, where $a(E) = \inf\{f(x) \mid x \in S \cap E\}$ and $b(E) = \sup\{f(x) \mid x \in S \cap E\}$. Then let

$$\mathcal{O}(f) = \mathcal{O}_X(f) = \inf\{b(E) - a(E) \mid E \subset X, \dim E = \infty\}.$$

The question then becomes: is $\mathcal{O}(f) = 0$?

If the answer is “yes” then

there exists a real number s such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a subspace E with $\dim E = \infty$ such that $|f(x) - s| < \varepsilon$ for all $x \in S \cap E$.

The collection of all the numbers s is called the *spectrum of f* and denoted by $\gamma_\infty(f)$ or $\gamma_\infty(f, X)$ (see [M.69]).

And so, we are asking whether the spectrum $\gamma_\infty(f)$ is non-empty for all uniformly continuous functions f on the sphere of an arbitrary Banach space X , or of some Banach space X ?

Intuition says that the answer is *obviously* negative, at least for $X = l_2$, say, because there is no reason for it to be positive. Uniform continuity is a local geometric condition with no connection to a linear structure of a space, and the existence of $s \in \gamma_\infty(f)$ is a global linear property. One never studies what seems to be obvious and the question was not an exception to this rule.

Note that James [J.64] showed that, in the above terminology, $\gamma_\infty(f, l_1)$ and $\gamma_\infty(f, c_0)$ are non-empty for f being an equivalent norm on these spaces. This result did not contradict the intuition, because the norms in l_1 and c_0 are in a sense extremal, and the proofs deeply depended on this fact. So, at the time, it did not even raise a similar question for, say, l_2 .

0.2 However, it was observed in 1967 ([M.67], *cf.* also [M.69], [M.71a]) that a slightly different *finite-dimensional spectrum* $\gamma(f)$ is always non-empty. We say that $s \in \gamma(f)$ whenever

for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and for every n there exists an n -dimensional subspace $E_n \subset X$ such that $|f(x) - s| < \varepsilon$ for all $x \in S \cap E_n$.

We have the following fact valid for every infinite-dimensional Banach space X .

Fact *For every uniformly continuous real function f on the unit sphere S , $\gamma(f) \neq \emptyset$.*

As we explained above, this somewhat contradicted intuitions of that time. Just to support these intuitions, let us recall the Grinblatt's paper [G.76] where an example was presented of a bounded continuous, but not uniformly continuous, function f on the sphere S in the Hilbert space, which has the oscillation at least 1 on every 2-dimensional central section of S . So the fact above indeed fundamentally rests on an interplay of uniform continuity of a function and non-compactness of the sphere.

Thus, since the finite-dimensional spectrum $\gamma(f)$ involves subspaces of arbitrarily high dimensions and it is always non-empty, it eventually became natural to expect that the (infinite-dimensional) spectrum $\gamma_\infty(f)$ is also non-empty.

0.3 Let us now consider the case when the function $f = \|\cdot\|$ is another norm on X , continuous with respect to the original norm. We have the following two mutually exclusive possibilities.

(a) Spectrum: For every norm f we have $\gamma_\infty(f) \neq \emptyset$. This would mean that either on some infinite-dimensional subspace f is arbitrarily small, if $0 \in \gamma_\infty(f)$, or, if $0 \neq s \in \gamma_\infty(f)$, then f is “almost” an isometry on some infinite-dimensional subspace.

(b) Distortion: There is a norm f such that $\gamma_\infty(f) = \emptyset$. This means that the norm f has an oscillation with respect to the original norm non-decreasing to zero on *any* infinite-dimensional subspace.

In view of the Fact above, the existence of a norm satisfying condition (b) would be clearly connected with some very essential infinite-dimensional effects.

If a uniformly continuous function f satisfies (b) then, obviously, there exists an interval $I = [\beta, \delta]$, with $\beta < \delta$, such that

- (i) for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a subspace $Y = Y_\varepsilon$, $\dim Y = \infty$, such that $I_Y(f) \subset [\beta - \varepsilon, \delta + \varepsilon]$;
- (ii) For every $E \subset Y$, $\dim E = \infty$ one has $I_E(f) \supset (\beta, \delta)$. (Here Y is a subspace from (i) corresponding to $\varepsilon = 1$, say.)

The collection of all such intervals I is called the *tilda-spectrum* of f and denoted by $\tilde{\gamma}(f)$.

Of course, the case $\delta = \beta$ reduces the interval to one point, $\beta \in \gamma_\infty(f)$, which we also consider as a part of $\tilde{\gamma}(f)$.

Therefore we have (see [M.69])

Fact *For every uniformly continuous real function f on the unit sphere S , $\tilde{\gamma}(f) \neq \emptyset$.*

0.4 Note that if f is a norm on X as in 0.3, and if $I = [0, \delta] \in \tilde{\gamma}(f)$, then necessarily $\delta = 0$ (see [M.69]).

In the case $\beta > 0$ we introduce a *level of distortion* of an interval $I \in \tilde{\gamma}(f)$ by $d(I) = \delta/\beta$, and a *level of distortion* of an equivalent norm f by

$$d(f) = \sup\{d(I) \mid I \in \tilde{\gamma}(f)\}.$$

We have a similar alternative as in 0.3.

- (a') Either for any equivalent norm f on X one has $d(f) = 1$,
- (b') or there exists an equivalent norm f on X such that $d(f) > 1$.

In terms of the spectrum, condition (a') means that for any equivalent norm f on X and any infinite-dimensional subspace Z of X , the spectrum $\gamma_\infty(f|_Z)$ of the restriction of f to Z , is non-empty. Similarly, condition (b') means that X contains a distortable infinite-dimensional subspace: there exists an infinite-dimensional subspace Z of X and an equivalent norm f on X such that $\gamma_\infty(f|_Z) = \emptyset$, that is, f is a distortion on Z .

It was proved by Milman in 1969 that

Theorem *Let X be a Banach space. Assume that $d(f) = 1$ for every equivalent norm f on X . Then either for some $1 \leq p < \infty$, X contains a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -isomorphic copy of l_p (for every $\varepsilon > 0$), or X contains a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -isomorphic copy of c_0 (for every $\varepsilon > 0$).*

(The result was stated in [M.69], Section 3.3, with the complete proof in [M.71b].)

And so, alternative (a') would imply an exciting structural theory for Banach spaces. However, in 1974, Tsirelson [Ts.74] constructed a space T which does not contain an isomorphic copy of any l_p ($1 \leq p < \infty$) or of c_0 . This means that the space T satisfies the alternative (b'): T contains a distortable infinite-dimensional subspace Z . (In fact, it can be shown by a direct argument that T itself is also distortable.)

An interesting feature of Tsirelson's example is that the norm is not given by an explicit formula but it is defined by an equation. This was the first construction of such a type, and essentially, with only minor modifications, the only one. In the dual form, which has been put forward by Figiel and Johnson [F-J.74], the norm is defined, for a finite sequence of real numbers $x \in \mathbb{R}^{(\mathbb{N})}$, by

$$\|x\|_T = \max \left\{ \|x\|_{c_0}, \frac{1}{2} \sup \sum_{i=1}^n \|E_i x\|_T \right\}, \quad (0.1)$$

where the inside supremum is taken over all successive intervals $\{E_i\}$ of positive integers such that $n < \min E_1 \leq \max E_1 < \min E_2 \leq \dots < \max E_{n-1} < \min E_n$ and over all n . For $x = \sum_i t_i e_i \in X$ and an interval E , we set $Ex = \sum_{i \in E} t_i e_i$. Tsirelson's space T is then a completion of $\mathbb{R}^{(\mathbb{N})}$ under the norm $\|\cdot\|_T$. Most of important properties of the space T and related spaces can be found in [C-S.89] and references therein.

0.5 Let us return to a distortion situation when $I = [\beta, \delta] \in \tilde{\gamma}(f)$ with $\beta < \delta$ and let us give its geometric interpretation.

Let $\varepsilon < (\delta - \beta)/2$ and let $Y = Y_\varepsilon$ be a corresponding subspace. Define two sets

$$A = \{x \in S \cap Y \mid f(x) < \beta + \varepsilon\} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \{x \in S \cap Y \mid f(x) > \delta - \varepsilon\}.$$

For every infinite-dimensional subspace $E \subset Y$ we have $A \cap E \neq \emptyset$ and $B \cap E \neq \emptyset$. A set satisfying such a property is called an *asymptotic* set (in Y). So in our situation, A and B are two asymptotic sets with positive distance apart, $\text{dist}(A, B) > 0$. The fact of the existence of such a pair (A, B) is thus a consequence of distortion. Conversely, this fact also implies some distortion property. The Urysohn function for sets A and B is a uniformly continuous function with an empty spectrum $\gamma_\infty(f)$; to construct an equivalent norm without spectrum some additional convexity assumptions are required.

0.6 Given a distortion situation it is natural to ask a quantitative question, how large can $d(f)$ be. Note that Theorem 0.4 ensures only the existence of distortion but provides no quantitative information on $d(f)$.

It is to Rosenthal's credit that in 1988 he asked the first named author, Odell and several others, how to find a direct formula for a distortion on Tsirelson's space, and how large such a distortion can be. Odell (unpublished) in 1989/90 constructed two asymptotic sets in T . He also showed that the spaces T_λ , obtained by replacing $1/2$ in the definition (0.1) by $1/\lambda$, have distortions d_λ of order $1/\lambda$, hence $d_\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. So, for every real number d , there is a space with a level of distortion at least d .

Let us mention that an approach to distortions using the theory of Krivine–Maurey types was presented in [H-O-R-S.91]. In particular this paper contains another proof of Theorem 0.4.

The next step was done by Schlumprecht [S.91], who changed $1/2$ to $1/\ln n$, which also allowed to start E_1 at any place (not necessarily far out). This had an important effect on the geometry of the space: the unit vector basis becomes subsymmetric and, as Schlumprecht showed, any distortion level is attained by some equivalent norm. Schlumprecht's space S also has the property of an *infinite distortion*:

there exists a sequence of asymptotic sets $\{A_i\}$ on the sphere of S such that $\text{dist}(A_i, \text{conv}(\bigcup_{j \neq i} A_j)) \geq 1$.

In fact, S satisfies still stronger condition that there also exists a sequence of sets $\{A_i^*\}$ on the sphere of the dual space S^* such that the system $\{A_i, A_i^*\}$ is “nearly biorthogonal”.

This was the starting point for Gowers’ and Maurey’s construction.

Finally, this year, Odell and Schlumprecht [O-S.92] proved that for every $1 < p < \infty$, l_p has an arbitrarily large (and even infinite) distortion, this way finishing off the problem which originated from [M.69], [M.71b]. Again, they did not construct asymptotic sets far apart in, say, l_2 , but transformed them in an ingenious non-linear way from Tsirelson’s space, or, on more advanced level, from Schlumprecht’s space. Combining this outstanding result with Theorem 0.4 we see that

Theorem *Any Banach space X which does not hereditarily contain copies of l_1 and c_0 , contains a distortable subspace, i.e., there exists an equivalent norm f on X such that $d(f) > 1$.*

Moreover, Odell and Schlumprecht proved that on the sphere $S(l_1)$ there is a Lipschitz function f (not a norm) with an empty spectrum, $\gamma_\infty(f, l_1) = \emptyset$. It was shown earlier by Gowers [G.91] that $\gamma_\infty(f, c_0) \neq \emptyset$, for any uniformly continuous function on $S(c_0)$.

0.7 Let us go back to the quantitative question: does any Banach space X not containing hereditarily copies of l_1 and c_0 , have arbitrarily large distortions?

This is not yet clear. To study this problem, we consider in this paper spaces with *bounded distortions*. These are spaces X such that for some constant D we have $d(f) \leq D$, for every infinite-dimensional subspace Z of X and every equivalent norm f on Z . What kind of simple “basic structural blocks” (*i.e.*, subspaces) can such a space X contain? To explain our result let us define the class of *asymptotic l_p* spaces. (The rather standard notation concerning successive blocks of a basis and related concepts will be explained at the beginning of the next section.)

Definition A Banach space X with a normalized basis $\{x_i\}$ is said to be *asymptotic l_p* space, for some $1 \leq p < \infty$ (resp. *asymptotic c_0* space) if there exists a constant C such that for every n there exists $N = N(n)$ such that any normalized successive blocks $N < z_1 < z_2 < \dots < z_n$ of $\{x_i\}$ are

C -equivalent to the unit vector basis in l_p^n (resp. in l_∞^n). By $\lambda_p(X)$ we denote the infimum of all constants C as above.

Note that Tsirelson's space T is an *asymptotic* l_1 space which does not contain a subspace isomorphic to l_1 .

For spaces with bounded distortions, let

$$d(X) = \sup d(f), \quad (0.2)$$

where the supremum is taken over all equivalent norms f on X .

Recall a standard and easy observation that if $Z \subset X$ is an infinite-dimensional subspace and f is an equivalent norm on Z then there exists an equivalent norm $\tilde{f}$ on X such that $\tilde{f}|_Z = f$. This immediately implies that $d(Z) \leq d(X)$.

Theorem *Let X be a Banach space with bounded distortions and let $d(X) < D$. There exists a subspace Y of X which is either asymptotic l_p , for some $1 \leq p < \infty$, or asymptotic c_0 . Moreover, $\lambda_p(Y)$ depends on D only.*

We learned recently that B. Maurey [Ma.92] also proved this theorem and used it to show that every space of type $p > 1$ with an unconditional basis has arbitrarily large distortions.

In contrast with the result for $d(X) = 1$ (Theorem 0.4), the theorem above recognizes, as “basic structural blocks”, a *class* of Banach spaces rather than a concrete space, as it was suggested by a “naive” intuition of the 60s. (It is well-known that varying λ in the definition of Tsirelson's spaces T_λ we get a sequence of non-isomorphic asymptotic l_1 spaces, and the so-called p -convexified Tsirelson's spaces show that the same phenomenon holds for any fixed $1 \leq p < \infty$ or c_0 .)

Another important point is a difference with the local theory of Banach spaces. The definition of asymptotic l_p spaces is “almost” local, in that it involves finite-dimensional subspaces and parameters not depending on the dimension. However, this isomorphic definition does not imply a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -isometric version, in the standard spirit of the local theory. Indeed, we would call a Banach space an *almost isometric asymptotic* l_p space if $\lambda_p(X) = 1$. It is well-known to specialists that every *almost isometric asymptotic* l_p space contains, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, a subspace $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -isomorphic to l_p (see 6.4 for a short argument).

Our method involves geometry of infinite-dimensional sphere and a suitable geometric language will be introduced in the next section.

1 Preliminaries

1.1 Since in this paper we are concerned with the existence of nice infinite-dimensional subspaces inside Banach spaces from a certain class, we may and will assume, unless stated otherwise, that Banach spaces discussed here have a monotone basis. In such a situation we will use the standard notions of the dual basis, equivalent bases, block bases, block subspaces, basic sequences, etc. They can be found *e.g.*, in [L-T.77]. Let us only mention that we will say that two basic sequences $\{x_i\}$ and $\{e_i\}$ are C -equivalent, for some constant C , if for any (finite) sequence of scalars $\{a_i\}$ we have

$$C^{-1} \left\| \sum_i a_i x_i \right\| \leq \left\| \sum_i a_i e_i \right\| \leq C \left\| \sum_i a_i x_i \right\|.$$

We will consider only vectors with finite support. For vectors $x, y \in X$ and subspaces E, E_1, E_2 , we will freely use the notation $n < x$ to denote that $n < \min \text{supp}(x)$; then $x < y$ if $\max \text{supp}(x) < \min \text{supp}(y)$; then $x < E$ if $x < y$ for every $y \in E$; and $E_1 < E_2$ if $x < y$ for every $x \in E_1$ and $y \in E_2$.

For a Banach space X by B_X and $S(X)$ we denote the unit ball and the unit sphere in X , respectively; for a subspace $E \subset X$ we set $B_E = B_X \cap E$ and $S(E) = S(X) \cap E$.

1.2 Asymptotic sets were defined in 0.5 where their basic connection to distortions was indicated. To get a better understanding of their geometric properties let us make some easy general observations, valid for arbitrary Banach spaces (which may have no basis).

Fact *Let $(Z, \|\cdot\|)$ be a Banach space and let $\|\!\|\!\| \cdot \|\!\|\!\|$ be a seminorm on Z such that $\|\!\|\!\|z\|\!\|\!\| \leq \|z\|$, for all $z \in Z$. Assume that there exists an asymptotic set $A \subset S(Z, \|\cdot\|)$ such that $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\!\|\!\| \cdot \|\!\|\!\|$ are equivalent on A . Then there exists a subspace E of Z of finite-codimension such that $\|\!\|\!\| \cdot \|\!\|\!\|$ is a norm on E equivalent to $\|\cdot\|$.*

Proof Clearly, $\|\!\|\!\| \cdot \|\!\|\!\|$ is a norm on the subspace W spanned by the set A , and since A is asymptotic then $\text{codim } W < \infty$. A standard well-known fact (*cf. e.g.*, [K.66], [L-T.77]) implies that if $\|\!\|\!\| \cdot \|\!\|\!\|$ and $\|\cdot\|$ were not equivalent on any subspace E of W of finite-codimension then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there would be an infinite-dimensional subspace F of W such that $\|\!\|\!\|z\|\!\|\!\| \leq \varepsilon \|z\|$, for all $z \in F$. But for ε sufficiently small this is impossible, since F intersects A . $\square$

Remark Let Z be a Banach space with bounded distortions, $d(Z) < D$, and let $A \subset S(Z)$ be an asymptotic set symmetric about the origin. Then there exists an infinite-dimensional subspace F of Z such that $(1/D)(B_Z \cap F) \subset \text{conv } A$.

Indeed, let W be the finite-codimensional subspace spanned by A . Applying the fact above to the norm $|\cdot|$ on W whose unit ball is $\text{conv } A \cap W$, we get that $\|\cdot\|$ and $|\cdot|$ are equivalent on a certain subspace E of W of finite codimension. Thus there exists an infinite-dimensional subspace F of E such that

$$\|z\| \leq |z| \leq D\|z\| \quad \text{for } z \in F. \quad (1.1)$$

This implies the required inclusion of the corresponding unit balls.

1.3 To make the arguments more compact, we introduce several short notations for certain families of subspaces of a given Banach space Z (with a basis). Typically, Z will be a block subspace of the fixed Banach space X .

By $\mathcal{B}_\infty(Z)$ we denote the family of all infinite-dimensional block subspaces $E \subset Z$; next, $\mathcal{B}^t(Z)$ denotes the family of all (block) subspaces $E \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(Z)$ of finite-codimension, *i.e.*, $\dim Z/E < \infty$; finally, if $Y \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(Z)$ and $z \in S(Z)$ (with finite support), then $\mathcal{B}^t(Y, z)$ denotes the family of all subspaces $F \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(Y)$ such that $z < w$ for all $w \in F$.

1.4 Let us recall the geometric notions of asymptotic averages and moduli, which play a major role in our approach. These notions were introduced and studied by Milman in 1967–70. A survey on this subject can be found in [M.71b], *cf.* also more recent paper [M-P.89].

The moduli are defined relatively to a fixed family $\mathcal{B}$ of subspaces of a space X , which satisfies the filtration condition

For every $E_1, E_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ there exists $E_3 \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $E_3 \subset E_1 \cap E_2$.

Typically, the family $\mathcal{B}$ will be $\mathcal{B}^t$, which have been defined in 1.3, although we will make an exception from this rule in Section 2.

For a continuous bounded function $h : S(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and an infinite-dimensional subspace $E \subset X$ define lower and upper moduli β - and δ -, respectively, by

$$\beta[h, \mathcal{B}, E] = \beta_x[h, \mathcal{B}(E)] = \sup_{F \in \mathcal{B}(E)} \inf_{x \in S(F)} h(x),$$

$$\delta[h, \mathcal{B}, E] = \delta_x[h, \mathcal{B}(E)] = \inf_{F \in \mathcal{B}(E)} \sup_{x \in S(F)} h(x). \quad (1.2)$$

For a continuous bounded function $f : S(X) \times S(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $E \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(X)$ we set

$$\begin{aligned} \beta\beta[f, \mathcal{B}, E] &= \beta_x[\beta_y[f(x, \cdot), \mathcal{B}(E, x)], \mathcal{B}, E] \\ \delta\delta[f, \mathcal{B}, E] &= \delta_x[\delta_y[f(x, \cdot), \mathcal{B}(E, x)], \mathcal{B}, E]. \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

Observe that if $E \subset F$ then

$$\beta[h, \mathcal{B}, F] \leq \beta[h, \mathcal{B}, E] \leq \delta[h, \mathcal{B}, E] \leq \delta[h, \mathcal{B}, F],$$

hence also

$$\beta\beta[f, \mathcal{B}, F] \leq \beta\beta[f, \mathcal{B}, E] \leq \delta\delta[f, \mathcal{B}, E] \leq \delta\delta[f, \mathcal{B}, F],$$

for all functions h and f as above.

2 Non-distortable spaces

To develop better geometric intuitions and to illustrate the use of the β - and δ -averages we start with the isometric case and we will sketch the proof of Milman's theorem on non-distortable spaces, Theorem 0.4.

2.1 In the isometric situation discussed here there is no real advantage in passing to a subspace with a basis, in fact, this would confuse a geometric picture rather than clarify it. Therefore we present an argument which makes no reference to the existence of a basis and thus it works for an arbitrary Banach space. The averages we will consider here will be taken with respect to the family $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}^0(E)$ of all finite-codimensional subspaces of a given space E . This family clearly satisfies the filtration condition.

We will consider the collection of functions

$$f_\varepsilon(x, y) = \|x + \varepsilon y\| - 1 \quad \text{for } x, y \in S(X). \quad (2.1)$$

The averages of functions f_ε will be called the β - and δ -moduli, as they reflect a geometric behaviour of the sphere in a Banach space.

For a subspace $E \subset X$ and $x \in S(X)$, the notation $\mathcal{B}(E, x)$ used in (1.3) simply means $\mathcal{B}^0(E)$. Also, $\mathcal{B}_\infty(E)$ denotes the family of all infinite-dimensional subspaces of E .

We will consider the local modulus $\beta_y[f_\varepsilon(x, \cdot), \mathcal{B}^0(E, x)]$ denoting it by $\beta(\varepsilon, x, E)$ and the global modulus $\beta\beta[f_\varepsilon, \mathcal{B}^0, E]$, denoting it by $\beta\beta(\varepsilon, E)$. Similarly, the local modulus $\delta_y[f_\varepsilon(x, \cdot), \mathcal{B}^0(E, x)]$ will be denoted by $\delta(\varepsilon, x, E)$ and the global modulus $\delta\delta[f_\varepsilon, \mathcal{B}^0, E]$, by $\delta\delta(\varepsilon, E)$.

To illustrate the expected behaviour of the moduli, let us observe that for $X = l_p$, $1 \leq p < \infty$ we have

$$\beta(\varepsilon, x, l_p) = \delta(\varepsilon, x, l_p) = (1 + \varepsilon^p)^{1/p} - 1,$$

for all $x \in S(l_p)$ and all $\varepsilon > 0$. This function has the order ε^p/p as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Computation of the moduli for some other spaces can be found in [M.71b].

2.2

Lemma *Let X be a Banach space such that $d(X) = 1$. There exists an infinite-dimensional subspace F of X such that*

$$\beta\beta(\varepsilon, F) = \delta\delta(\varepsilon, F) \quad \text{for } \varepsilon > 0. \quad (2.2)$$

Proof It is not difficult to see that if $d(f) = 1$ for every equivalent norm f on Z then $\mathcal{O}_Z(g) = 0$ for every $Z \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(X)$ and every uniformly continuous convex function $g : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We will show this at the end of the proof.

Observe that for each $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x \in S(X)$, the function $f_\varepsilon(x, \cdot)$ is convex, therefore $\mathcal{O}(f_\varepsilon(x, \cdot)) = 0$. Stabilizing over y with a given $\theta > 0$ we get a subspace $\tilde{E} \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(X)$ such that

$$0 \leq \sup_{y \in S(\tilde{E})} f_\varepsilon(x, y) - \inf_{y \in S(\tilde{E})} f_\varepsilon(x, y) < \theta \quad \text{for } x \in S(\tilde{E}). \quad (2.3)$$

Now we take a dense set $\{x_i\}$ in the unit sphere $S(X)$ and a sequence of $\theta_i \downarrow 0$, and we let, for every $i = 1, 2, \dots$, ε vary over a finite θ_i -net $\mathcal{N}_i$ in $[\theta_i, 1/\theta_i]$; this way we can construct a sequence $E_1 \supset \dots \supset E_i \supset \dots$ of infinite-dimensional subspaces such that on $S(E_i)$ the inequality analogous to (2.3) holds for x_j , with $j = 1, \dots, i$, and θ_i and all $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{N}_i$, ($i = 1, 2, \dots$). Picking $e_i \in S(E_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots$ and setting $E = \text{span}[e_i]$, we get, by this

diagonal procedure, $E \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(X)$ such that for all $x \in S(E)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ we have

$$\beta(\varepsilon, x, E) = \delta(\varepsilon, x, E).$$

Now, with a fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, the function $\delta(\varepsilon, \cdot, E)$ is again convex. Stabilizing over x , with a fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, and then passing to a diagonal in a similar way as before, we get an infinite-dimensional subspace F of E on which (2.2) holds.

It remains to show that $\mathcal{O}_Z(g) = 0$ for every $Z \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(X)$ and every uniformly continuous convex function $g : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. To this end, fix $Z \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(X)$ and pick $[\beta, \delta] \in \tilde{\gamma}(g)$, and, for an arbitrary (fixed) $\varepsilon > 0$, let $Y \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(Z)$ be a corresponding stabilizing subspace, satisfying conditions (i) and (ii) from 0.3.

Assume first that $g(x) = g(-x)$ for $g \in S(X)$. Consider the symmetric asymptotic sets A and B defined in 0.5. By Remark in 1.2 (with $D = 1 + \varepsilon$) we get a subspace $E \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(Y)$ such that $B \cap E \subset B_E = B_X \cap E \subset (1 + \varepsilon)\text{conv } A$. Thus, by convexity and uniform continuity of g , we have

$$\delta - \varepsilon - \theta \leq \inf_{z \in B \cap E} g(z) \leq \sup_{w \in A} g(w) + \theta \leq \beta + \varepsilon + \theta,$$

where $\theta = \theta(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ we get $\beta = \delta$, hence $\mathcal{O}_Z(g) = 0$.

If g is arbitrary, set $h(x) = (1/2)(g(x) + g(-x))$. Since $\mathcal{O}_Y(h) = 0$, find a subspace $Y_1 \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(Y)$ such that $|h(x) - s| < \varepsilon$ for all $x \in S(Y_1)$. If ε is small enough then $|s - (\beta + \delta)/2| < 2\varepsilon$, hence $\beta + \varepsilon < s < \delta - \varepsilon$. (In fact, we will use the later inequality only.) Indeed, otherwise $g(x)$ and $g(-x)$ would not compensate each other. Formally, pick $w, v \in S(Y_1)$ such that $g(w) = \beta + \varepsilon$ and $g(v) = \delta - \varepsilon$ and observe that

$$s - (\beta + \delta)/2 \leq (s - h(w)) + ((g(w) + g(-w))/2 - (\beta + \delta)/2) \leq 2\varepsilon;$$

and similarly, using $h(v)$, it is easy to establish the lower estimate by -2ε .

Consider the set $A = \{y \in S(Y_1) \mid |g(y) - s| \leq \varepsilon\}$, which is asymptotic in Y_1 . Observe that for $y \in A$ we have

$$|g(-y) - s| \leq |g(y) + g(-y) - 2s| + |g(y) - s| \leq 3\varepsilon,$$

so that A is “almost” symmetric. By Remark in 1.2 we get a subspace $E \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(Y_1)$ such that $B_E \subset (1 + \varepsilon)\text{conv}(A \cup -A)$. Thus for every $z \in S(E)$ we have,

$$g(z) \leq \sup_{w \in A \cup -A} g(w) + \theta \leq s + 3\varepsilon + \theta,$$

where $\theta = \theta(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. This, combined with the stabilization property of h , yields that $\mathcal{O}_Z(g)$ is arbitrarily small, hence equal to 0, as required. $\square$

Remark In the non-distortion situation of the lemma it is not difficult to show that X contains a subspace with a basis $\{u_i\}$ such that for every n and for all blocks $n < w < v$ we have $\max(\|w + v\|, \|w - v\|) \leq (1 + 2^{-n})\|w + v\|$. A standard argument shows that the tails of $\{u_i\}$ are unconditional with the constants as close to 1 as we wish. We could then consider the moduli related to the family $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}^t$ and note that the argument from 2.3 applies for these moduli as well. Moreover, in this situation it would be clearly sufficient to discuss the observation opening the proof of the lemma only for symmetric functions.

2.3 Sketch of the proof of Theorem 0.4 We will show that the equality $\beta\beta(\varepsilon, F) = \delta\delta(\varepsilon, F)$ yields that the space F contains $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -isomorphic copies of l_p or c_0 .

Using definitions of $\beta\beta(\varepsilon, F)$ and $\delta\delta(\varepsilon, F)$ it is possible, given $\eta > 0$, to construct a basic sequence $\{y_i\}$ in F such that for any finite sequence $\{a_i\} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ of real numbers the norm $\|\sum_i a_i y_i\|$ admits an upper estimate by $(1 + \eta)\Phi(\{\delta\delta(|a_i|, F)\})$ and a lower estimate by $(1 + \eta)^{-1}\Phi(\{\beta\beta(|a_i|, F)\})$, where $\Phi(\{\cdot\})$ is a real function defined on the space of all finite sequences of real numbers (see [M.71b], Theorem 4.5). Moreover, the same estimates are satisfied for every vector of the form $\sum_i a_i u_i$, where $\{u_i\}$ is a block basis of $\{y_i\}$. (This argument is similar to a well-known construction sketched in 6.4.) By Lemma 2.2, this implies that all block bases of $\{y_i\}$ are $(1 + \eta)$ -equivalent. By Zippin's theorem, the basis $\{y_i\}$ is $(1 + \eta)^\alpha$ -equivalent to the unit vector basis in l_p , for some $1 \leq p < \infty$ or in c_0 (here $\alpha > 0$ is a numerical constant). $\square$

3 Tilda-spectrum in general

3.1 Let X be a Banach space with a basis $\{x_i\}$. Let $f(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_l)$ be a uniformly continuous real function defined on sequences of l normalized block vectors $z_1 < z_2 < \dots < z_l$. First let us describe a rough intuition of an

interval $[\beta, \delta]$ of tilda-spectrum of f on a subspace $\tilde{Y} \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(X)$, leaving the precise definition for later parts of this section.

Let $\tilde{I}$ be the closure of the interval of values of f on $\tilde{Y}$. By restricting the domain of the variable z_l to any subspace of $\tilde{Y}$, with other variables fixed, we do not increase $\tilde{I}$. Therefore, for any $z_1 < z_2 < \dots < z_{l-1}$ fixed, let Y_1 be a subspace of $\tilde{Y}$ such that passing with z_l to Y_1 corresponds to the “maximal decrease” of $\tilde{I}$. Let $I^{(1)}$ be the closure of the interval of values of this restricted f . Continue the procedure of restricting z_{l-1} , with $z_1 < z_2 < \dots < z_{l-2}$ fixed. The closed interval $I^{(l)} = [\beta, \delta]$ obtained after the l -th step is called an interval of the tilda-spectrum of f in $\tilde{Y}$.

3.2 Let $\tilde{Y} \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(X)$. The precise definition of the tilda-spectrum of f on $\tilde{Y}$ involves the notions of the β - and δ - averages, introduced in 1.4. These averages will be applied to functions of the form $h(z_1, \dots, z_k)$, considered as functions of z_k with $z_1 < \dots < z_{k-1}$ fixed, and with respect to the family $\mathcal{B}^t(Y, z_{k-1})$ of all finite-codimensional block subspaces of Y with the support after z_{k-1} ($Y \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(X)$ is a subspace). To make the formulas more compact, we will indicate the variable z_k and the subspace Y in the subscripts, leaving z_{k-1} to be understood from the context. Thus we will write, *e.g.* $\beta_{z_k, Y}(h(z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}, z_k))$ for $\beta[h(z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}, \cdot), \mathcal{B}^t(Y, z_{k-1})]$, and so on.

We say that an interval $[\beta, \delta]$ is in the tilda spectrum of f on $\tilde{Y}$ if there is a subspace $Y \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(\tilde{Y})$ such that the following two conditions are satisfied:

- (i) $\beta = \beta_{z_1, Y}(\beta_{z_2, Y}(\dots(\beta_{z_l, Y}(f(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_l)))\dots))$
and
 $\delta = \delta_{z_1, Y}(\delta_{z_2, Y}(\dots(\delta_{z_l, Y}(f(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_l)))\dots));$
- (ii) for all $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_l \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(Y)$, each of the averages $\beta_{z_i, Y}$ and $\delta_{z_i, Y}$ in (i) can be replaced by β_{z_i, H_i} and δ_{z_i, H_i} , respectively; that is, we have
 $\beta = \beta_{z_1, H_1}(\beta_{z_2, H_2}(\dots(\beta_{z_l, H_l}(f(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_l)))\dots))$
and
 $\delta = \delta_{z_1, H_1}(\delta_{z_2, H_2}(\dots(\delta_{z_l, H_l}(f(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_l)))\dots)).$

A subspace Y for which the above conditions hold is called a spectrum subspace corresponding to $[\beta, \delta]$. Then any further subspace Y' of Y is a spectrum subspace as well.

3.3 To prove the existence of the tilda-spectrum defined in 3.2, it is convenient to introduce modified averages β^{st} and δ^{st} . The definition requires several steps.

3.3.1 Let $h(z_1, \dots, z_k)$ be a uniformly continuous function and let $E \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(X)$. Fix normalized blocks $z_1 < \dots < z_{k-1}$ and set

$$\gamma(E) = \inf(\delta_{z_k, G}(h(z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}, z_k)) - \beta_{z_k, G}(h(z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}, z_k))),$$

where the infimum is taken over all subspaces $G \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(E)$. Pick $\varepsilon_i \downarrow 0$ and construct a sequence $G_0 = E \supset G_1 \supset \dots$, such that $G_i \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(G_{i-1})$ and

$$\delta_{z_k, G_i}(h(z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}, z_k)) - \beta_{z_k, G_i}(h(z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}, z_k)) \leq \gamma(G_{i-1}) + \varepsilon_i, \quad (3.1)$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots$. Set

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{z_k, E}^{st}(h) &= \beta_{z_k, E}^{st}(h; z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}) \\ &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \beta_{z_k, G_i}(h(z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}, z_k)), \\ \delta_{z_k, E}^{st}(h) &= \delta_{z_k, E}^{st}(h; z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}) \\ &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \delta_{z_k, G_i}(h(z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}, z_k)). \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Let $G = \text{span}[u_i]$ be a diagonal subspace for $\{G_i\}$, that is, $u_i \in G_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots$. It is easy to check from (3.1) that for every subspace $H \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(G)$ we have

$$\beta_{z_k, E}^{st}(h) = \beta_{z_k, H}(h) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_{z_k, E}^{st}(h) = \delta_{z_k, H}(h). \quad (3.3)$$

3.3.2 Now let $\{(z_1^{(i)}, \dots, z_{k-1}^{(i)})\}$ be a dense countable subset of $(k-1)$ -tuples of normalized blocks $z_1 < \dots < z_{k-1}$. Let $G^{(1)} = G$ be the subspace constructed at the end of 3.3.1 for $(z_1^{(1)}, \dots, z_{k-1}^{(1)})$. Starting from $G^{(1)}$, construct $G^{(2)} \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(G^{(1)})$ for the tuple $(z_1^{(2)}, \dots, z_{k-1}^{(2)})$. Proceeding by induction and using (3.3) we get a sequence of subspaces $E \supset G^{(1)} \supset G^{(2)} \supset \dots$ such that for every $i = 1, 2, \dots$ and all $H, H' \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(G^{(i)})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{z_k, H}(h(z_1^{(i)}, \dots, z_{k-1}^{(i)}, z_k)) &= \beta_{z_k, E}^{st}(h; z_1^{(i)}, \dots, z_{k-1}^{(i)}) \\ &= \beta_{z_k, H'}(h(z_1^{(i)}, \dots, z_{k-1}^{(i)}, z_k)), \\ \delta_{z_k, H}(h(z_1^{(i)}, \dots, z_{k-1}^{(i)}, z_k)) &= \delta_{z_k, E}^{st}(h; z_1^{(i)}, \dots, z_{k-1}^{(i)}) \\ &= \delta_{z_k, H'}(h(z_1^{(i)}, \dots, z_{k-1}^{(i)}, z_k)). \end{aligned}$$

Taking once more a diagonal subspace we get $F = \text{span}[v_i]$, with $v_i \in G^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots$ such that for all $(k-1)$ -tuples $(z_1, \dots, z_{k-1})$ and for all subspaces $H \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(F)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{z_k, H}(h(z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}, z_k)) &= \beta_{z_k, E}^{st}(h; z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}) \\ \delta_{z_k, H}(h(z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}, z_k)) &= \delta_{z_k, E}^{st}(h; z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}).\end{aligned}\quad (3.4)$$

3.3.3 Coming back to the definition 3.2 of the tilda-spectrum, fix a function $f = f(z_1, \dots, z_l)$ and a subspace $\tilde{Y} \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(X)$.

The existence of a tilda-spectrum interval $[\beta, \delta]$ will be proved by providing explicit formulae for β and δ in terms of the stabilized averages β^{st} and δ^{st} . This is done by the backward induction.

Let

$$\begin{aligned}b_1(z_1, \dots, z_{l-1}) &= \beta_{z_l, \tilde{Y}}^{st}(f; z_1, \dots, z_{l-1}) \\ d_1(z_1, \dots, z_{l-1}) &= \delta_{z_l, \tilde{Y}}^{st}(f; z_1, \dots, z_{l-1}),\end{aligned}$$

and let $F_1 \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(\tilde{Y})$ be the subspace constructed at the end of 3.3.2 for which (3.4) is satisfied.

Repeat the procedure inside F_1 by setting

$$\begin{aligned}b_2(z_1, \dots, z_{l-2}) &= \beta_{z_{l-1}, F_1}^{st}(b_1; z_1, \dots, z_{l-2}) \\ d_2(z_1, \dots, z_{l-2}) &= \delta_{z_{l-1}, F_1}^{st}(d_1; z_1, \dots, z_{l-2}),\end{aligned}$$

and let $F_2 \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(F_1)$ be the corresponding subspace.

Proceed by an obvious induction to get functions b_i and d_i for $i = 1, \dots, l$ and subspaces $\tilde{Y} \supset F_1 \supset \dots \supset F_l$. Set

$$\begin{aligned}\beta = b_l &= \beta_{z_1, F_{l-1}}^{st}(b_{l-1}) \\ &= \beta_{z_1, F_{l-1}}^{st} \left(\beta_{z_2, F_{l-2}}^{st} \left(\dots \left(\beta_{z_l, \tilde{Y}}^{st}(f; z_1, \dots, z_{l-1}) \right) \dots \right) \right), \\ \delta = d_l &= \delta_{z_1, F_{l-1}}^{st}(d_{l-1}) \\ &= \delta_{z_1, F_{l-1}}^{st} \left(\delta_{z_2, F_{l-2}}^{st} \left(\dots \left(\delta_{z_l, \tilde{Y}}^{st}(f; z_1, \dots, z_{l-1}) \right) \dots \right) \right).\end{aligned}\quad (3.5)$$

It is easy to see, using (3.4), that with these definitions of β and δ , the interval $[\beta, \delta]$ satisfies conditions (i) and (ii) of 3.2 for the subspace $Y = F_l$.

3.4 Using the definition of the β - and δ - averages it is easy to see that condition (i) of the definition of the tilda-spectrum in 3.2 is equivalent to the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(i')} \quad & \forall \theta > 0 \quad \exists Y_1 \in \mathcal{B}^t(Y) \quad \forall z_1 \in S(Y_1) \quad \exists Y_2 \in \mathcal{B}^t(Y_1, z_1) \quad \forall z_2 \in S(Y_2) \\ & \exists Y_3 \in \mathcal{B}^t(Y_2, z_2) \quad \forall z_3 \in S(Y_3) \quad \dots \quad \exists Y_l \in \mathcal{B}^t(Y_{l-1}, z_{l-1}) \quad \forall z_l \in S(Y_l) \\ & f(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_l) \in [\beta - \theta, \delta + \theta]. \end{aligned}$$

We will show below that this condition implies in fact a stronger property, that is, the existence of a stabilizing subspace for f . Given an interval $[\beta, \delta]$ satisfying condition (i) on a subspace Y we can construct, for any $\theta > 0$, a subspace $G \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(Y)$ such that for all normalized blocks $z_1 < z_2 < \dots < z_l$ in G we have

$$f(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_l) \in [\beta - \theta, \delta + \theta]. \quad (3.6)$$

Fix $\theta' > 0$ and $\eta > 0$ to be defined later. Let $E_1 = Y_1 \in \mathcal{B}^t(Y)$ be the subspace satisfying condition (i') for θ' . Pick an arbitrary vector $u_1 \in S(E_1)$, and let $E_2 = Y_2 \in \mathcal{B}^t(Y_1, u_1)$ be the subspace from condition (i') (again for θ'). Pick an arbitrary vector $u_2 \in S(E_2)$.

In the next step we would like to find a subspace $E_3 \in \mathcal{B}^t(E_2, u_2)$ which would satisfy condition (i') in several ways: it could be taken as Y_3 , for vectors $z_1 = u_1$ and $z_2 = u_2$, and it could be taken as Y_2 , for an arbitrary vector z_1 running over some finite η -net $\mathcal{N}$ (in the original norm) on the sphere $S(\text{span}[u_1, u_2])$. Since subspaces appearing in (i') are always of finite codimension, it is clear that a required subspace E_3 exists. Then pick an arbitrary $u_3 \in S(E_3)$.

Continuing in an obvious manner we construct a subspace $G = \text{span}[u_i]$ such that $f(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_l) \in [\beta - \theta', \delta + \theta']$ for all $z_1 < \dots < z_l$ with z_i s running over all finite η -nets on the spheres $S(\text{span}[z_1, \dots, z_k])$ (with $k = 2, 3, \dots$). Choosing suitable $\eta > 0$ and $\theta' > 0$ depending on θ , we complete the proof of (3.6).

Remark Given a sequence $\theta_n \downarrow 0$ we can repeat the above construction for every n and then pass to a diagonal subspace. We then obtain a subspace $Z \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(Y)$ with a (block) basis $\{v_i\}$ such that for every n and for arbitrary normalized blocks $n < z_1 < \dots < z_l$ of $\{v_i\}$ we have

$$f(z_1, \dots, z_l) \in [\beta - \theta_n, \delta + \theta_n].$$

3.5 The role of condition (ii) of the definition of the tilda-spectrum is to ensure the existence of large sets of vectors on which the value of the function f is close to extremal. In fact, these sets turn out to be asymptotic in some stabilizing subspace for f .

Let us start by observing that condition (ii) from 3.2 is equivalent to the following:

(ii') for all $\eta > 0$ and all subspaces $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_l \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(Y)$ we have:
 $\exists w_1 \in S(H_1) \exists w_2 \in S(H_2), w_2 > w_1 \dots \exists w_l \in S(H_l), w_l > w_{l-1}$
 $f(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_l) \leq \beta + \eta$
 and
 $\exists v_1 \in S(H_1) \exists v_2 \in S(H_2), v_2 > v_1 \dots \exists v_l \in S(H_l), v_l > v_{l-1}$
 $f(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_l) \geq \delta - \eta$.

Let $[\beta, \delta]$ be in the tilda-spectrum of f and let Z be the corresponding stabilizing subspace constructed in Remark 3.4. Condition (ii') leads to the natural definition of sets asymptotic in Z .

With a fixed $\eta > 0$ define $A_1 \subset S(Z)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 = \{ & w_1 \in S(Z) \mid \forall H_2, \dots, H_l \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(Z) \\ & \exists w_2 \in S(H_2), w_2 > w_1 \exists w_3 \in S(H_3), w_3 > w_2 \dots \\ & \exists w_l \in S(H_l), w_l > w_{l-1} \ f(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_l) \leq \beta + \eta \}. \end{aligned}$$

By (ii'), the set A_1 has a non-empty intersection with every subspace $H_1 \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(Z)$, hence A_1 is asymptotic in Z .

By induction, let $1 \leq k < l$, and assume that for any fixed $w_1 < \dots < w_{k-1}$, with $w_i \in A_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k-1$, the set $A_k = A_k(w_1, \dots, w_{k-1})$ has been defined by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} A_k = \{ & w_k \in S(Z) \mid \forall H_{k+1}, \dots, H_l \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(Z) \\ & \exists w_{k+1} \in S(H_{k+1}), w_{k+1} > w_k \exists w_{k+2} \in S(H_{k+2}), w_{k+2} > w_{k+1} \dots \\ & \exists w_l \in S(H_l), w_l > w_{l-1} \ f(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_l) \leq \beta + \eta \}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

Moreover, assume that A_k is asymptotic in Z . Then for any fixed $w_1 < \dots < w_k$, with $w_i \in A_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$, define A_{k+1} by the formula analogous to (3.7). It clearly follows from the form of A_k that A_{k+1} is asymptotic in Z .

Similarly, we can define sets $U_k \subset S(Z)$ for $j = k, \dots, l$, which are also asymptotic in Z , and such that if $v_1 < \dots < v_l$ and $v_i \in U_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, l$ then $f(v_1, \dots, v_l) \geq \delta - \eta$.

3.6 The notion of tilda-spectrum has the following unconditionality property. For a given function f and a finite sequence $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \dots)$ with $\varepsilon_1 = \pm 1, \varepsilon_2 = \pm 1, \dots$, define the function f_ε by

$$f_\varepsilon(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_l) = f(\varepsilon_1 z_1, \varepsilon_2 z_2, \dots, \varepsilon_l z_l),$$

for normalized blocks $z_1 < \dots, z_l$. Then if $[\beta, \delta]$ is in the tilda-spectrum of f and Y is a corresponding spectrum subspace, then for all the f_ε s, $[\beta, \delta]$ is again a spectrum interval with the same spectrum subspace Y . Moreover, the stabilizing subspace $Z \subset Y$ of 3.4 is also preserved for all the f_ε s. Note however, that the asymptotic sets A_i and U_i described in 3.5 are not the same.

3.7 The final important step in our discussion of tilda-spectrum is an observation that a construction of stabilizing subspaces in 3.4 can be done “almost” simultaneously for any countable family of uniformly continuous real functions, $f_k = f_k(z_1, \dots, z_{l_k})$. For a subspace $\tilde{Y} \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(X)$ and a sequence $\theta_k \downarrow 0$, there exists $Z \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(\tilde{Y})$ such that for every $n = 1, 2, \dots$, if $L_n = \max_{k \leq n} l_k$, then for arbitrary normalized blocks $n < z_1 < \dots < z_{L_n}$ in Z we have

$$f_k(z_1, \dots, z_{l_k}) \in [\beta_k - \theta_n, \delta_k + \theta_n] \quad \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq n.$$

Here $[\beta_k, \delta_k]$ is an interval in the tilda-spectrum of f_k in $\tilde{Y}$. Moreover, all the sets $A_i^{(k)}$ and $U_i^{(k)}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots$, constructed in 3.5 for the function f_k , are asymptotic in Z .

This follows from 3.4 and 3.5 by the standard diagonal procedure. The details are left for the reader.

4 Spaces with bounded distortions

We now pass to the main theorem on spaces with bounded distortions, Theorem 0.7.

4.1 By passing to an infinite-dimensional subspace of X and considering a suitable renorming of X we may assume, without loss of generality, that X

has a monotone basis. The proof of the theorem relies on stabilization properties of a family of real functions which we introduce now and fix throughout the rest of the argument. This family is indexed by the set $\mathcal{Q}_+^{(\mathbb{N})}$ of all finite sequences with positive rational coordinates; for $a = (a_1, \dots, a_l) \in \mathcal{Q}_+^{(\mathbb{N})}$ define the function f_a on a sequence $z_1 < \dots < z_l$ of normalized blocks by

$$f_a(z_1, \dots, z_l) = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^l a_i z_i \right\|.$$

Let $\{a^{(k)}\}$ be an enumeration of $\mathcal{Q}_+^{(\mathbb{N})}$. We will write f_k for $f_{a^{(k)}}$. Fix $\theta_k \downarrow 0$ satisfying $\theta_k < (1/2D)\|a^{(k)}\|_\infty$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots$. Let $Z \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(X)$ be the stabilizing subspace for all the f_k s, constructed in 3.7. Let $[\beta_k, \delta_k]$ denote the corresponding spectrum intervals for f_k ($k = 1, 2, \dots$).

The major role in our approach is played by two positive real valued functions on $\mathcal{Q}^{(\mathbb{N})}$ defined via tilda-spectrum of the f_k s as follows. With fixed θ_k , Z , and $[\beta_k, \delta_k]$, as above, we let, for $a = a^{(k)} \in \mathcal{Q}_+^{(\mathbb{N})}$,

$$g(a) = \beta_k \quad \text{and} \quad r(a) = \delta_k. \quad (4.1)$$

These definitions can be naturally extended to all $\mathcal{Q}^{(\mathbb{N})}$, by setting, for $\pm a = (\pm a_1, \dots, \pm a_l)$, $g(\pm a) = g(a)$ and $r(\pm a) = r(a)$. We call the functions g and r the *enveloping functions* of X .

4.2 The main part of the proof of the theorem is contained in the following proposition concerning the behaviour of functions g and r for spaces with bounded distortions.

Proposition *Assume that a Banach space X has bounded distortions and let $d(X) < D$. With the notation from 4.1, either there exists $1 \leq p < \infty$ such that*

$$(1/D') \left(\sum |a_i|^p \right)^{1/p} \leq g(a) \leq r(a) \leq D' \left(\sum |a_i|^p \right)^{1/p} \quad \text{for } a \in \mathcal{Q}^{(\mathbb{N})},$$

or

$$(1/D') \max |a_i| \leq g(a) \leq r(a) \leq D' \max |a_i| \quad \text{for } a \in \mathcal{Q}^{(\mathbb{N})}.$$

where $D' = 4D$.

4.3 Assuming the truth of Proposition 4.2 let us complete the proof of the theorem.

Proof of Theorem 0.7 Let $\{x_i\}$ denote the block basis for the stabilizing subspace Z , which has been fixed in 4.1. Assume that the conclusion of Proposition 4.2 is satisfied for some $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ (with the obvious convention for $p = \infty$). We will then show that Z is asymptotic- l_p (or asymptotic- c_0 , if $p = \infty$).

Fix n and fix $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n) > 0$ to be defined later. Let $b^{(1)}, \dots, b^{(M)}$ be an ε -net in the unit sphere $S(l_p^n)$ of l_p^n in the l_∞ -norm, and assume without loss of generality that $b^{(i)} \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{N})$ for $1 \leq i \leq M$. Thus for every i there is $k = k_i$ such that $b^{(i)} = a^{(k)}$. Let $N = \max_{1 \leq i \leq M} k_i$.

Let $N < y_1 < \dots < y_n$ be arbitrary normalized blocks of $\{x_k\}$. By 3.7 and Proposition 4.2 we have, for every $1 \leq i \leq M$,

$$\begin{aligned} (1/D)\|b^{(i)}\|_p - \theta_k &\leq g(b^{(i)}) - \theta_k \leq \|b_1^{(i)}y_1 + \dots + b_n^{(i)}y_n\| \\ &\leq r(b^{(i)}) + \theta_k \leq D\|b^{(i)}\|_p + \theta_k. \end{aligned}$$

By the choice of θ_k this implies

$$(1/2D) \leq \|b_1^{(i)}y_1 + \dots + b_n^{(i)}y_n\| \leq 2D$$

An easy approximation argument shows that if ε is sufficiently small (it is enough to take $\varepsilon = (4Dn)^{-1}$) then the latter estimates imply

$$(1/4D) \leq \|c_1y_1 + \dots + c_ny_n\| \leq 4D,$$

for any $(c_1, \dots, c_n) \in S(l_p^n)$. Thus $y_1 < \dots < y_n$ are D' -equivalent to the unit vector basis in l_p^n , as required. $\square$

5 Inequalities for enveloping functions

The proof of Proposition 4.2 is based on specific properties of functions g and r in spaces with bounded distortions, which will be established in this section. In what follows we keep the notation from 4.1, and in particular, $Z \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(X)$ is the stabilizing subspace for the functions $\{f_k\}$, constructed in 3.7.

5.1 A space Y with a basis $\{y_i\}$ is said to be *asymptotically unconditional* if there exists a constant D' such that for every n there exists $N = N(n)$ such that for any normalized blocks $N < z_1 < \dots < z_n$ of $\{y_i\}$ and any sequence of reals $(c_1, \dots, c_n)$ we have

$$\sup_{\varepsilon_i = \pm 1} \|\varepsilon_1 c_1 z_1 + \dots + \varepsilon_n c_n z_n\| \leq D' \inf_{\varepsilon_i = \pm 1} \|\varepsilon_1 c_1 z_1 + \dots + \varepsilon_n c_n z_n\|. \quad (5.1)$$

Lemma *Let X be a Banach space with bounded distortions. Then it contains a subspace $Y \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(X)$ which is asymptotically unconditional.*

Proof Assume that X has a basis $\{x_i\}$. Given $\alpha > 0$, we will construct a block basis $\{y_i\}$ for which (5.1) holds with the constant $D' = (1 + \alpha)d(X)$ and $N(n) = n$.

We will use a common and convenient notation that if I and J are intervals of positive integers then $I < J$ means $\max_{i \in I} i < \min_{j \in J} j$. Moreover, for $x = \sum_i t_i x_i \in X$, we set $Ix = \sum_{i \in I} t_i x_i$.

We may assume that X does not contain c_0 , otherwise the proof would be finished. For a positive integer n define the norm $\| \cdot \|_n$ on X by

$$\| \|x\| \|_n = \sup \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i I_i x \right\|,$$

where the supremum is taken over all intervals $I_1 < \dots < I_n$ and all $\varepsilon_i = \pm 1$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Clearly, $\|x\| \leq \| \|x\| \|_n \leq n\|x\|$ for $x \in X$, so $\| \cdot \|_n$ is an equivalent norm on X . We will show that the set

$$A_n = \{x \in S(X) \mid \| \|x\| \|_n \leq (1 + \alpha)\} \quad (5.2)$$

is asymptotic in X . Thus, by the Remark in 1.2 and (1.1), for every $X' \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(X)$ there is $F_n \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(X')$ such that $\| \|x\| \|_n \leq (1 + \alpha)D\|x\|$ for $x \in F_n$. This leads to the inductive construction of subspaces $X = F_0 \supset F_1 \supset \dots \supset F_n \supset \dots$ with $F_n \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(F_{n-1})$ and $\|x\| \leq \| \|x\| \|_n \leq (1 + \alpha)D\|x\|$ for $x \in F_n$ ($n = 1, 2, \dots$). It is easy to check that any block basis $\{y_n\}$ such that $y_n \in S(F_n)$ satisfies (5.1) with $D' = (1 + \alpha)D$.

To show that the set A_n given by (5.2) is asymptotic in X , let $W = \text{span}[w_i] \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(X)$. Fix $N > n$ to be defined later. Let

$$a_N = \sup \left\{ \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N \eta_j w_j \right\| \mid \eta_j = \pm 1 \right\} = \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N \eta_j^0 w_j \right\|.$$

Since X does not contain c_0 , we have $a_N \rightarrow \infty$, as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Set $w = \sum_{j=1}^N \eta_j^0 w_j$. Given intervals $I_1 < \dots < I_n$, let L_i be the set of all j such that $\text{supp } w_j \subset I_i$ and let K_i be the set of all j such that $I_i w_j \neq 0$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$. For every $\varepsilon_i = \pm 1$, with $i = 1, \dots, n$, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i I_i w \right\| \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \left(\sum_{j \in L_i} \eta_j^0 w_j \right) \right\| + 2n \leq a_N + 2n.$$

Therefore $\|w/a_N\|_n \leq 1 + 2n/a_N$. Thus, if $a_N > 2n/\alpha$, then $w/a_N \in A_n \cap S(W)$ hence A_n is asymptotic in X . $\square$

5.2 Let X be a Banach space with bounded distortions, let $Y \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(X)$ be an asymptotically unconditional subspace of X , for some constant D' arbitrarily close to D which can be chosen later, and let $Z \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(Y)$ be the stabilizing subspace for $\{f_k\}$ constructed in 3.7.

The following lemma investigates the behaviour of enveloping functions g and $r : \mathcal{Q}^{(N)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma *Assume that a Banach space X has bounded distortions and let $d(X) < D$. Then*

$$g(a) \leq r(a) \leq 3Dg(a) \quad \text{for } a \in \mathcal{Q}^{(N)}.$$

Proof The left hand side inequality is obvious. To prove the right hand side inequality, for $i = 1, \dots, l_k$ and $k = 1, 2, \dots$, let $A_i^{(k)}$ and $U_i^{(k)}$ denote the i th asymptotic sets, constructed for the function f_k and the subspace Z , as in 3.5.

We will prove that, with fixed $a = a^{(k)} \in \mathcal{Q}_+^{(N)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \exists G_1 \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(Z) \quad \forall z_1 \in S(G_1) \quad \exists G_2 \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(G_1, z_1) \quad \forall z_2 \in S(G_2) \dots \\ f_k(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{l_k}) \leq D(\beta_k + \theta_k). \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

Applying (5.3) to vectors from the appropriate sets $U_i^{(k)}$, for $i = 1, \dots, l_k$, we get

$$\delta_k - \theta_k \leq f_k(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{l_k}) \leq D(\beta_k + \theta_k).$$

By the choice of θ_k from 4.1 we have $\theta_k \leq (1/2D)\|a^{(k)}\|_\infty \leq \beta_k/2$, the latter inequality yields

$$r(a) = \delta_k \leq 3D\beta_k \leq 3Dg(a). \quad (5.4)$$

To prove that (5.3) holds, first note that since Z is asymptotically unconditional, we can assume, without loss of generality that all the sets $A_i^{(k)}$ s are symmetric about the origin. Consider $A_1^{(k)} \subset S(Z)$. By the Remark in 1.2 there exists $G_1 \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(Z)$ such that

$$(1/D)(B_X \cap G_1) \subset \text{conv} A_1^{(k)}.$$

Thus for every $z_1 \in S(G_1)$ there exist $w^1, \dots, w^m \in A_1^{(k)}$ and $t_1, \dots, t_m$, with $t_j > 0$ and $\sum_j t_j = 1$, such that $(1/D)z_1 = \sum_j t_j w^j$.

Now set $G_{2,0} = G_1$ and proceed by induction in $j = 1, \dots, m$. For $j \geq 1$ consider the set $A_2^{(k)}(w^j) \cap G_{2,j-1}$ constructed for the vector w^j . Arguing as before we get a subspace $G_{2,j} \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(G_{2,j-1}, w^j)$ such that

$$(1/D)(B_X \cap G_{2,j}) \subset \text{conv}(A_2^{(k)}(w^j)).$$

Let $G_2 = G_{2,m} \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(G_1, z_1)$. For a fixed $j = 1, \dots, m$, we have, for an arbitrary vector $z_2 \in S(G_2)$,

$$(1/D)z_2 = \sum_{n=1}^{m'} s_{n,j} u^{n,j},$$

with $u^{n,j} \in A_2^{(k)}(w^j)$ and $s_{n,j} > 0$ for $n = 1, \dots, m'$ and $\sum_n s_{n,j} = 1$.

We repeat the process l_k times, for all subsets $A_i^{(k)}$ with $i = 1, 2, \dots, l_k$. We then have, by the definitions of f_k and of the sets $A_i^{(k)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} f_k(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{l_k}) &= D \|(1/D)a_1 z_1 + (1/D)a_2 z_2 + \dots\| \\ &\leq D \sum_j t_j \|a_1 w^j + (1/D)a_2 z_2 + \dots\| \\ &\leq D \sum_j t_j \sum_n s_{n,j} \|a_1 w^j + a_2 u^{n,j} + \dots\| \\ &\leq \dots \leq D(\beta_k + \theta_k), \end{aligned}$$

which is the required estimate (5.3). $\square$

5.3 Next lemma establishes general properties of the function $r : \mathcal{Q}^{(\mathbb{N})} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. It says that r can be extended in a natural way to the 1-unconditional and 1-subsymmetric norm on the space $\mathbb{R}^{(\mathbb{N})}$ of all real finite sequences. Moreover, denoting by $\{e_i\}$ the standard unit vector basis in $\mathbb{R}^{(\mathbb{N})}$, the extended norm has certain blocking property.

Recall that a norm $|\cdot|$ on $\mathbb{R}^{(\mathbb{N})}$ is 1-subsymmetric if for every sequence $a = (a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots) \in \mathbb{R}^{(\mathbb{N})}$ we have $|(a_1, 0, \dots, 0, a_2, 0, \dots, 0, a_3, \dots)| = |a|$.

Lemma *The function $r(\cdot)$ can be extended to the 1-unconditional and 1-subsymmetric norm on $\mathbb{R}^{(\mathbb{N})}$. If $\{u_i\}$ is a block basis of the standard unit vector basis with $r(u_i) = 1$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots$, then for every $a \in \mathbb{R}^{(\mathbb{N})}$ we have*

$$g(a) \leq r(d) \leq r(a). \quad (5.5)$$

where for $a = (a_1, \dots, a_l) = \sum_i a_i e_i$, by d we denote the sequence $d = \sum_i a_i u_i$.

Proof Consider $r(\cdot)$ as a function on $\mathcal{Q}^{(\mathbb{N})}$. It is clearly positively homogeneous and we will prove the triangle inequality by showing that if $a, b \in \mathcal{Q}^{(\mathbb{N})}$ then $r(a + b) \leq r(a) + r(b)$.

Indeed, let $a = a^{(i)} = (a_1, a_2, \dots)$, $b = a^{(j)} = (b_1, b_2, \dots)$, and $a + b = a^{(m)}$. Fix an arbitrary $\eta > 0$. Pick arbitrary vectors $w_j \in U_j^{(m)}$, for $j = 1, 2, \dots$. Then

$$r(a + b) - \eta \leq \|(a_1 + b_1)w_1 + (a_2 + b_2)w_2 + \dots\|,$$

moreover,

$$\|a_1 w_1 + a_2 w_2 + \dots\| \leq r(a) + \eta \quad \text{and} \quad \|b_1 w_1 + b_2 w_2 + \dots\| \leq r(b) + \eta.$$

Since $\eta > 0$ is arbitrary, this shows the triangle inequality.

Recall that for a sequence $a = (a_1, a_2, \dots)$, we set $\pm a = (\pm a_1, \pm a_2, \dots)$. Then we have $r(a) = r(\pm a)$, hence the norm $r(\cdot)$ is 1-unconditional. It is also clearly 1-subsymmetric.

To prove (5.5), let $u_i = \sum_{j=k_i+1}^{k_{i+1}} b_j e_j$, for some $0 \leq k_1 < k_2 < \dots$, be a block basis with rational coefficients of the standard unit vector basis, with $r(u_i) = 1$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots$. Let $a = (a_1, \dots, a_l) = \sum_i a_i e_i$, then $d = \sum_i a_i u_i = (d_1, \dots, d_{k_{l+1}})$, where $d_j = a_i b_j$ for $k_i < j \leq k_{i+1}$ and $i = 1, 2, \dots$.

Let $\eta > 0$. There exist vectors $w_1 < w_2 < \dots < w_{k_{l+1}}$ in appropriate asymptotic sets such that

$$r(d) - \eta \leq \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{k_{l+1}} d_j w_j \right\|.$$

Since all the vectors belong to Z , we also have, from the form of d ,

$$c_i = \left\| \sum_{j=k_i+1}^{k_{i+1}} d_j w_j \right\| \leq |a_i|(r(u_i) + \eta) = |a_i|(1 + \eta),$$

for $i = 1, \dots, l$. By the triangle inequality and the unconditionality of the norm $r(\cdot)$ this implies $r(c_1, \dots, c_l) \leq r(a)(1 + \eta)$.

Setting $w^i = (1/c_i) \sum_{j=k_i+1}^{k_{i+1}} d_j w_j$ we get

$$r(d) - \eta \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^l c_i w^i \right\| \leq r(c_1, \dots, c_l) + \eta$$

which combined with the previous inequality shows the right hand side of (5.5).

The proof of the left hand side inequality is similar. For an arbitrary $\eta > 0$, pick vectors $w'_1 < w'_2 < \dots < w'_{k_{l+1}}$ in appropriate asymptotic sets (for appropriate functions f_i) such that for every $i = 1, \dots, l$ one has

$$1 - \eta = r(u_i) - \eta \leq \left\| \sum_{j=k_i+1}^{k_{i+1}} b_j w'_j \right\| \leq r(u_i) + \eta = 1 + \eta.$$

Then

$$\left\| \sum_i a_i \sum_{j=k_i+1}^{k_{i+1}} b_j w'_j \right\| = \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{k_{l+1}} d_j w'_j \right\| \leq r(d) + \eta.$$

On the other hand, setting $v_i = \sum_{j=k_i+1}^{k_{i+1}} b_j w'_j$ for $i = 1, \dots, l$ we have $1 - \eta \leq \|v_i\| \leq 1 + \eta$. Then

$$\left\| \sum_i a_i \sum_{j=k_i+1}^{k_{i+1}} b_j w'_j \right\| = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^l a_i v_i \right\| \geq (g(a) - \eta)(1 - \eta).$$

Combining the last two estimates we complete the proof of the left hand side of (5.5). $\square$

5.4 Now we can easily complete the proof of Proposition 4.2.

Proof of Proposition 4.2 Let L denotes the completion of $(\mathbb{R}^{(\mathbb{N})}, r(\cdot))$, and let $\{e_i\}$ be the standard unit vector basis in L . Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3 yield that all normalized block bases of $\{e_i\}$ are (3D)-equivalent to $\{e_i\}$. By Zippin's theorem, this implies that the $\{e_i\}$ is equivalent to the standard unit vector basis in l_p , for some $1 \leq p < \infty$ or in c_0 . Moreover, the equivalence constant depends on D only. $\square$

6 Asymptotic l_p spaces, general properties

We conclude this paper with few simple remarks on general asymptotic l_p spaces. To avoid tiresome repetitions, when talking about spaces l_p or asymptotic l_p , respectively, we adopt the convention that the case of $p = \infty$ corresponds to the space c_0 or asymptotic c_0 , respectively.

Let Y with a basis $\{y_i\}$ be an asymptotic l_p space for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, and let $\lambda_p(Y)$ be the asymptotic l_p constant, as defined in 0.7.

6.1 It is well-known and easy to see that any block subspace of l_p is complemented. The same is true in Tsirelson space and in its convexifications (*cf. e.g.*, [C-S]), although in this case the argument is much more complicated. An analogous fact for arbitrary asymptotic l_p space says that finite-dimensional block subspaces far out are uniformly complemented.

More precisely, for $C > \lambda_p(Y)$, if $N(n) = N < z_1 < \dots < z_n$ are normalized blocks C -equivalent to the standard unit vector basis in l_p^n , then there exists a projection P from Y onto $\text{span}[z_i]_{i=1}^n$ with $\|P\| \leq 2C^2$.

Indeed, pick $z_i^* \in Y^*$ such that $\|z_i^*\| = z_i^*(z_i) = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Let $N < E_1 < \dots < E_n$ be intervals of positive integers such that $\text{supp } z_i \subset E_i$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and that the union of all the E_i s is an interval. For $x \in Y$ set

$$Px = \sum_{i=1}^n z_i^*(E_i x) z_i.$$

Since $E_j z_i = 0$ if $i \neq j$, then P is a projection. Moreover, we have

$$\|Px\| \leq C \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |z_i^*(E_i x)|^p \right)^{1/p} \leq C \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \|E_i x\|^p \right)^{1/p}$$

$$\leq C^2 \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \|E_i x\| \left(\frac{E_i x}{\|E_i x\|} \right) \right\| \leq C^2 \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n E_i x \right\| \leq 2C^2 \|x\|,$$

as required.

6.2 If Y is an asymptotic l_p space (for $1 < p \leq \infty$) then the dual Y^* is an asymptotic $l_{p'}$ space. This follows from 6.1 by a general duality argument. A direct calculation is just as standard and simple and we leave it to the reader.

6.3 It is easy to observe that if $p > 1$, the basis in Y is shrinking and if $p < \infty$, the basis is boundedly complete. Hence for $1 < p < \infty$, an asymptotic l_p space is reflexive.

Assume to the contrary that the basis $\{y_i\}$ is not shrinking. There exists $x^* \in Y^*$ with $\|x^*\| = 1$, and $\delta > 0$, and a normalized block basis $\{u_i\}$ of $\{y_i\}$ such that $|x^*(u_i)| > \delta$. Fix n to be defined later. Then for every k we have

$$\left\| \sum_{i=k}^{k+n-1} u_i \right\| \geq \left| x^* \left(\sum_{i=k}^{k+n-1} u_i \right) \right| \geq n\delta.$$

On the other hand, if k is large enough, the left hand side is smaller than or equal to $C n^{1/p}$. Choosing appropriate n we get a contradiction, if $p > 1$.

Assume the basis is not boundedly complete. Then there exists normalized block basis $\{u_i\}$ of $\{y_i\}$ such that $\sup_n \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n u_i \right\| = M < \infty$. On the other hand if $u_k < \dots < u_{k+n-1}$ is far enough, then

$$\left\| \sum_{i=k}^{k+n-1} u_i \right\| \geq (1/C) n^{1/p}.$$

If $p < \infty$, we again come to a contradiction by an appropriate choice of n .

6.4 The notion of asymptotic l_p spaces is fundamentally an isomorphic concept and it cannot be reduced to a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -isometric one. As mentioned in 0.7, to the contrary to the local concept of finite representability of l_p , asymptotic l_p does not imply any related almost isometric property of a block subspace. To be more precise let us discuss the quantity $\lambda_p(Y)$ in more detail.

Note that the isometric condition $\lambda_p(Y) = 1$ is equivalent to the fact that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and for every n there exists $N = N(\varepsilon, n)$ such that any normalized blocks $N < z_1 < z_2 < \dots < z_n$ are $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -equivalent to the standard unit vector basis in l_p^n . (In 0.7 we called such a space an *almost isometric asymptotic l_p space*.)

Recall that if a space Y merely satisfies a weaker condition: for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $N = N(\varepsilon)$ such that any two normalized blocks $N < z_1 < z_2$ are $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -equivalent to the standard unit vector basis in l_p^2 , then, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, Y contains an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -isomorphic copy of the l_p -space. Let us sketch this well-known and standard argument.

Given $\varepsilon > 0$, fix $\varepsilon_i \downarrow 0$ such that $\prod_i (1 + \varepsilon_i) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)$. By an easy induction pick a sequence of normalized blocks $u_1 < u_2 < \dots < u_i < \dots$ such that $N(\varepsilon_i) < u_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots$. Then the block basis $\{u_i\}$ is $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -equivalent to the standard unit vector basis in l_p . Indeed, for any finite sequence of scalars $\{a_i\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i u_i \right\| &\leq (1 + \varepsilon_1) \left(|a_1|^p + \left\| \sum_{i=2}^{\infty} a_i u_i \right\|^p \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon_1)(1 + \varepsilon_2) \left(|a_1|^p + |a_2|^p + \left\| \sum_{i=3}^{\infty} a_i u_i \right\|^p \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq \dots \leq \prod_i (1 + \varepsilon_i) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |a_i|^p \right)^{1/p}. \end{aligned}$$

In a similar way we get the lower estimate, hence

$$(1 + \varepsilon)^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |a_i|^p \right)^{1/p} \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i u_i \right\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |a_i|^p \right)^{1/p},$$

as required.

Clearly, $\lambda_p(Y)$ is an isomorphic invariant. However, there exist spaces Y such that $\lambda_p(Y) < \infty$ but there is no equivalent norm $\|\cdot\|$ on Y such that for some block subspace $Z \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty}(Y)$ the equality $\lambda_p(Y, \|\cdot\|) = 1$ would hold. The construction above obviously yields that this is true for every asymptotic l_p space which does not contain subspaces isomorphic to l_p . In particular, Tsirelson space and its convexifications have this property.

References

- [C-S.89] CASAZZA, P. G. & SHURA, T., “Tsirelson’s space”. Lecture Notes in Math., 1363, Springer Verlag, 1989.
- [F-J.74] FIGIEL, T. & JOHNSON, W. B., A uniformly convex Banach space which contains no l_p . *Compositio Math.*, 29 (1974), 179–190.
- [G.92] GOWERS, W. T., Lipschitz functions on classical spaces. *European J. Comb.*, to appear
- [Gr.76] GRINBLAT, L. S., Circles in the unit sphere of a Hilbert space. *J. of Funct. Anal.*, 31 (1979), 272–274.
- [G-M.92] GOWERS, W. T. & MAUREY, B., The unconditional basic sequence problem. Preprint.
- [H-O-R-S.91] HAYDON, R. & ODELL, E. & ROSENTHAL, H. P. & SCHLUMPRECHT, TH., On distorted norms in Banach spaces and the existence of l_p types. Preprint.
- [J.64] JAMES, R. C., Uniformly non-square Banach spaces. *Ann. of Math.*, 80 (1964), 542–550.
- [K.66] KATO, T., “Perturbation theory for linear operators”. Springer Verlag, 1966.
- [L-T.77] LINDENSTRAUSS, J. & Tzafriri, L., “ Classical Banach spaces, Vol. I”. Springer Verlag, 1977.
- [M.67] MILMAN, V. D., Infinite-dimensional geometry of the unit sphere in a Banach space. *Soviet Math. Dokl.*, 8 (1967), 1440–1444.
- [M.69] MILMAN, V. D., Spectrum of continuous bounded functions on the unit sphere of a Banach space. *Funct. Anal. Appl.*, 3 (1969), 67–79.
- [M.71a] MILMAN, V. D., New proof of the theorem of Dvoretzky. *Funct. Anal. Appl.*, 5 (1971), 28–37.

- [M.71b] MILMAN, V. D., The geometric theory of Banach spaces, Part II. *Usp. Math. Nauk* 26 (1971), 73–149.(in Russian) (English translation: Russian Math Surveys 26 (1971), 79–163.)
- [M-P.89] MILMAN, V. D.& PERELSON, A., Infinite dimensional geometric moduli and type–cotype theory. in “Geometric aspects of Banach spaces”, (ed. E. Martinez-Peinador and Rodes), London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes Series, 140 (1989), 11–38.
- [Ma.92] MAUREY, B., Private communication.
- [O-S.92] ODEL, E. & SCHLUMPRECHT, TH., The distortion problem. Preprint.
- [S.91] SCHLUMPRECHT, TH., An arbitrarily distortable Banach space. To appear
- [Ts.74] TSIRELSON, B. S. Not every Banach space contains l_p or c_0 . *Funct. Anal. Appl.*, 8 (1974), 138–141.